

## **Oral History Cover Sheet**

**Name:** Guy Connolly

**Date of Interview:** January 27, 2010

**Location of Interview:** Lakewood, Colorado

**Interviewer:** John Cornely

**Approximate years worked for Fish and Wildlife Service: 1959-62; 1975-86**

**Offices and Field Stations Worked, Positions Held:** Two summers as student trainee at National Bison Range, Montana 1959-60; 1 year on Range Survey Crew on Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, Oregon 1961-62; break from FWS and went to University of California, Hopland Field Station 1962-75; back to FWS in 1975 at the Denver Wildlife Research Center, Predator Control Methods Field Station, Twin Falls, Idaho; to Washington D.C. with FWS Division of Wildlife Research in 1985-86; transfer with ADC program to USDA APHIS; back to Twin Falls, Idaho in 1986; finally at Denver Wildlife Research Center in Colorado, 1989-97.

**Most Important Projects:** Deer and coyote research in California; coyote depredation controls including the livestock protection collar; the 1994 ADC Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

**Colleagues and Mentors:** C.J. Henry, Charles Rouse, Dr. Richard Taber, Chuck Peck, Russ Reidinger, Gary Simmons, Dr. William Longhurst, Don Balser, Sam Linhart, James Lee.

**Brief Summary of Interview:** Mr. Connolly starts off talking about his early life, where he went to college, and how he started working for the Fish and Wildlife Service. He also talks about leaving the Service to work with Dr. William Longhurst at the University of California, Hopland Field Station before returning to FWS to do coyote research at the Denver Wildlife Research Center, Twin Falls, Idaho field station. He moved to the FWS Division of Wildlife Research in Washington D.C., and while there was transferred with the entire ADC Program to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service. He returned to the Denver Wildlife Research Center, Twin Falls, Idaho, in 1986 and later moved to DWRC headquarters in Lakewood, Colorado before his retirement. He shares many stories of his time with FWS and USDA APHIS, such as the work he did on the livestock protection collar and trying to get 1080 approved for use in the collars, working on an Environmental Impact Statement for ADC, and overseeing the Pocatello Supply Depot. While a student trainee at National Bison Range, Mr. Connolly led tours through the range. He was there in 1959 when Big Medicine, the famous white bison, died at 26 years of age.

**John:** This is John Cornely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Heritage Committee. It's the 27<sup>th</sup> of January in 2010, and I have the pleasure of visiting with Guy Connolly today at his home. He's going to tell us about his life and career with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and later with U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is an interesting story in and of itself. So without further ado, Guy, go ahead and tell about your life and career.

**Guy:** Thank you John, I'm pleased to do that. We're talking at my home today in Lakewood, Colorado. I've lived here for twenty years, but I was born in St. Paul, Minnesota in 1938 in a hospital near the state capitol. I was the second of five children; my parents were both born and raised in the St. Paul area. Nothing significant in the wildlife line happened to me in those days other than when I was about five years old my dad brought a farmhouse out in the country that had been vacant for two years and there was a colony of bats living in the attic. We didn't know about the bats until we moved in.

My dad remodeled that house as we lived there and I remember the bats would come out and fly around our rooms after dark when we turned off the light to go to bed; pretty scary. My dad got tired of all the bats and in those days we had no idea of how to get rid of nuisance bats without killing them. My dad stayed up one night and killed 115 bats with a broom, and I just remember the next morning they were all laying in a wheel burrow outside our back door. My assignment that day was to haul

them away and dig a hole and bury them.

When I was eight years old, my family moved to Billings, Montana. It was a job thing with my father of course. He was a draftsman, a commercial artist, and his forte was designing restaurant layouts and commercial kitchens. He worked for firms that sold commercial restaurant kitchen equipment. My dad would design custom layouts for specific customers and then the firm would sell them the equipment. Anyway, one of things I remember about Billings when we got there is how the sun would shine in the winter. For the first time in my life I realized why people had sunglasses, we never had to know about that in Minnesota.

The other thing I remember, and this was 1946 when we moved to Billings, is that the money there was silver dollars. You couldn't get a paper dollar for anything, but those silver dollars, we thought they were awful because they wore out your pants pockets pretty bad. And of course now I wish I had a bushel of them, but we didn't know any better then.

I went through school in Billings, Montana, graduated from Billings Senior High School in 1956. At that time I was very much of a music person, more so than an outdoor person. I hunted all I could while I was growing up and as soon as I was old enough to get my dad to buy me a shotgun he did so. But I went off to college to be a music major.

I entered the University of Montana at Missoula and majored in music for the year of 1956-57. During that year my dad changed jobs again and

he had to move to Denver, so when my school year was up at Missoula, my parents wanted me to come down to Denver and go to college closer to home. I had been recruited by some people from the University of Colorado at Boulder for their music school, and so I transferred there and went to CU Music School starting in the fall of 1957. And I remember about two weeks after school started that semester, the Russians put Sputnik into orbit in October 1957.

Well I was a music major that semester and the main thing I learned there was I didn't want to do that for a living. So by the end of that semester, which was January of 1958, I decided to go back to Montana and go into the field of wildlife management. They did not have a wildlife department at CU Boulder, so for my second semester there I transferred into the engineering school and took some of the basic courses that you would have to take in any line of science.

During spring break at CU in Boulder, I hit the road back to Montana and made arrangements to enter the MSU Forestry School that fall. At that time the Forestry professors had lots of summer jobs with government agencies that they would dole out to students that they thought were deserving. Right on the spot when I was talking to them about entering their school, I was not yet admitted, they gave me my choice of three summer jobs in the field with the Forest Service or BLM. So I signed up for a GS-3 fire control aide job with the Lewis and Clark National Forest at Stanford, Montana. My main duty there was going to be to man the fire lookout tower at Yogo Peak, which is not far from Kings Hill, just north of White Sulphur Springs, Montana.

So I duly returned to Colorado, completed the term at CU in engineering; passed all the courses. The instant school was out in June 1958 I hit the road in my old car back to Montana to get on the job with the Forest Service at Stanford, Montana, because I had to get to work right away to start earning some money; I only had what money I earned myself to live on. So I worked all that summer as a fire guard, and while doing that I also completed a correspondence course in trigonometry, which the forestry school people at Missoula had coached me to do. They said if I didn't do that I would be a full year behind in the sequence of courses that were required in forestry, like surveying, and you had to have trigonometry before you took surveying. So I did the correspondence course, it was pretty easy; I passed it.

I arrived in Missoula in September of 1958 to enter the forestry school and I also got back in all the music stuff that I had been doing before, before I left Missoula in 1957. I was the first horn player in the Missoula Civic Symphony during my whole time in the forestry school. I even got a music scholarship at one point, not very much money, but it was significant because the music faculty had a big fight about giving the scholarship to somebody who wasn't a music major. This was kind of a chronic problem I had with trying to do music all the time I was a forestry and wildlife major. In the forestry school I actually majored in Forest Conservation but I aimed as much as I could at wildlife and range management.

One day I saw a notice posted on the bulletin board that interested parties could take the civil service examination for the student trainee job at the National Bison Range. It was understood that if

you were a student trainee you worked for the Fish and Wildlife Service during the summers and then went back to school and finished your college. When you graduated, if you liked the Fish and Wildlife Service and they liked you, you would be offered a full-time, permanent job with them. This sounded good to me, so I did that civil service test and scored well on it; as I recall it was just a general IQ test. But lo and behold I was lucky enough to be chosen to be the student trainee; there was only one job and there were probably twenty, at least, who took the test.

So I was thrilled to go to work at the National Bison Range in June 1959. The refuge manager there at the time was C. J. Henry. He had come out there not too many years before from Seney Refuge in Michigan. He wasn't very knowledgeable about bison or range management or the west, but was a good manager and a terrific mentor and supervisor.

My main job at the Bison Range as student trainee was to conduct public range tours for people who had come in their cars and they would sign up ahead of time. We had a range tour every afternoon for a couple of hours. It was a driving tour, a loop through the refuge about 18 miles in length -- dirt roads and pretty steep in places. But the people would drive in their own cars and the tour leader, usually me, would go ahead in a jeep or a government vehicle and stop wherever we saw bison or whatever and would point out the animals and other interesting sights.

The Bison Range was very interesting to me because I was interested in big game management, not waterfowl which is really the Fish and Wildlife Service main thing, or it was in those days. So the Bison Range was a

primo spot for budding big game biologists. Beside the bison, which were the namesake and the reason for establishment of the refuge, they also had elk, mule deer, whitetail deer, big horn sheep, and pronghorn antelope. In later years, after I wasn't there anymore, they also got some mountain goats and I think they still have some. As I say, it was the most interesting place to work.

One of my extra jobs that summer was raising a bison calf that had been orphaned in some way that I don't remember now. I trained this bison calf to drink from a bottle with a nipple on it, and later from a bucket. And I'd weigh him once a week and keep statistics on his growth and so on. He never did get really tame, but it was kind of an experience for me raising a buffalo calf.

On the Bison Range at that time, the most famous animal was Big Medicine, the white bison. He was not a pure albino but a partial albino. He had been born in 1933. So in 1959 Big Medicine was 26 years old; he died in August that year.

Big Medicine was kept in an exhibition pasture where people could come, drive around and look at him anytime during daylight. One day a tourist stopped in at the office and told us Big Medicine was down and struggling and it looked like there was something wrong, so Babe May, the refuge foreman, and I ran out there to take a look and sure enough he was dying. So we stayed with him until he died.

The refuge people, of course, had anticipated for a long time that he would die and plans had been made about the disposition of his remains. So we were really prepared to take care of him. We got a forklift out there, got him onto a truck, hauled him up to the refuge

slaughter house two and a half miles away, and instantly skinned him and took care of the hide and the horns and the remains.

It had been prearranged that Bob Scriver, the famous taxidermist in Browning, up in the Blackfoot country northwest of Great Falls, would make the whole body mount of this animal, which he did. The full body mount now is on display at the State Historical Society in Helena, Montana just across the street from the state capital. He looks a lot better in that mount than he did live during his final year because he had lost a lot of condition and a lot of weight in his waning years. Anyway that episode has stuck in my memory ever since.

Well I made that summer job last as long as I could because I needed all the money I could save to go to school on. It was a long time until my next paying job the next summer would come around. So I returned to school that fall, and again in 1960 returned to the Bison Range as student trainee. I finished that second summer satisfactorily to the refuge manager, so he did recommend to the regional office that I be offered a biologist job when I graduated, and this did come to pass.

I graduated from the University of Montana Forestry School in June 1961; graduation was on a Monday. Helen and I got married on Thursday, June 8 and by the next Monday I was supposed to be on my new job at the Malheur Wildlife Refuge with the range survey crew, which was headed up by Charles Rouse.

I had known for about six weeks that the Malheur, south of Burns, Oregon, would be my permanent assignment and I found out right away there was no living quarters for married

people out at the refuge. I was told that we either would have to rent a place to live in town, in Burns 32 miles away from the headquarters, or we'd have to bring a mobile home that we could live in. So we bought a trailer house in Missoula from a fellow forestry graduate, a friend of mine, and our honeymoon consisted of hauling that house trailer behind our car down to the Malheur Refuge and getting it set up so I could begin work there.

The range survey crew was kind of an unusual group. It was part of the refuge branch in Fish and Wildlife Service Region 1, which then was headquartered in Portland. The range crew consisted of three persons. The leader was Charles H. Rouse, long time Fish and Wildlife Service biologist; he himself had graduated from the University of Montana, Missoula in 1929. The other two spots on the range crew were junior positions, like mine, the third fellow was Chuck Peck, who...

**John:** I know Chuck real well.

**Guy:** ...later became manager of the Pocatello, Idaho group of refuges. Chuck had been on the crew a year before I came. It seemed like there was a regular pattern. There would be just two young men on the range crew and one of us would be replaced every year. You'd be there two years and then you'd move on someplace else. Well Chuck left to join the Army because he was about to be drafted. His place was taken by Eldon McLaury, who went on to a long career with the Fish and Wildlife Service; I believe he's retired and lives in Wisconsin now.

**John:** Yeah, he's in Madison.

**Guy:** Yeah, so you know him?

**John:** Yeah, I know him.

**Guy:** Well I'd been on the range survey crew for about a year and during that time we were surveying the Malheur Refuge, as I mentioned. However the crew headquarters was in Lakeview, Oregon, 170 miles away from the Malheur Refuge headquarters. So the range crew would be in Lakeview weekends and Monday morning they would drive out to the Malheur to resume work; they'd stay in house trailers out there all week doing the survey work and then they'd return to Lakeview Friday afternoon. Except my wife and I, that first summer, we just took our trailer to the refuge at Burns, and we stayed there until fall when the field season was wound up and the crew retreated into the office in Lakeview for the winter. We then moved our trailer on down to Lakeview.

**John:** Where did you, that first year that you were staying at the refuge in your trailer, where did you set it up?

**Guy:** Well, we got to the refuge that day with our trailer and we thought, "Boy this is a gorgeous place, we're going to like this." There was nice green lawns, and pretty stone buildings, and they said, "Your place is going to be out down by the shop." So we were out in the weeds, down by the shop, out in the sun. Not a real attractive location but it was okay. I'm shuffling through my pictures here of the range crew days. This is us towing the trailer with a Ford Sedan; this is on top of Wright's Point.

**John:** Okay.

**Guy:** And this is the location where our trailer was. It was, as I said, a hot, dry, sunny location but there was a big covey of quail that came by every morning at the same time, so it was okay. The main detriment to the location was the mosquitos, they had terrific mosquitos there, and they're still there. We made a trip through there recently and they're just as bad as they ever were.

**John:** That's the worse place I've ever been for mosquitos and I've been to Alaska and I've been to a lot of places they say are bad, but I've never seen anything to match Malheur.

**Guy:** They're really fierce and they're the same now as they were 40 or 50 years ago. Another interesting thing about Malheur is, when I worked there the summers of '61 and '62, was quite a dry period and the lake level was low, the lowest it had been since the depression years of the '30's. Consequently the lake really didn't amount to much and it was mostly mudflats, and cattails and bulrushes. But it didn't make too much difference on the range survey because we were just surveying the upland part of the vegetation where cattle would graze if they were allowed, or where deer or antelope or other wildlife would be using the vegetation.

**John:** You know we were still using the range survey when I was there and I got there in 1978. We used that survey as part of some refuge planning, which I think is almost continuous.

**Guy:** Yeah.

**John:** But what I don't remember was, was there some kind of plan where they

would do Hart Mountain, say, or Sheldon for a few years and then move to Malheur and vice versa?

**Guy:** Yes.

**John:** There was a kind of a plan to go from refuge to refuge.

**Guy:** Yeah, there was a grand scheme to this range survey business. The crew had already surveyed most of the other large western refuges; they'd already done the Desert Game Range, the Sheldon Range and Refuge, the Hart Mountain Refuge, the Fort Peck in Montana, and the Malheur was really the last large one. I was on the crew only 15 months, and we were occupied with the Malheur totally during that time.

The Sheldon/Hart Mountain Refuge office in Lakeview is where our headquarters was and so just being there I got very well acquainted with the Sheldon and Hart Mountain people including the manger Ben Haseltine, the refuge biologist Ock or Oscar V. Deming, the resident manager out on Hart Mountain, a young man named John Hill, and similarly out on the Sheldon, Larry Worden. The secretary in the office was Mabel Thornton, from a prominent, local family. She never tired of telling us about her son Skip, who was mayor of Lakeview.

Lakeview was a town of about 3500 people when we came there in 1961, we liked it a lot. It was very isolated, there was no McDonalds, Burger King or anything like that. There was no interstate freeway within 100 miles and still is not. In recent trips back through there, we see that Lakeview has even fewer people now than it did 40 and 50 years ago, and that's the only place I've lived where I could say that;

most every other place has gained lots of people.

Anyway, after I'd been on the crew for just over a year, a research job in deer management opened up at the University of California. The job was to be research assistant to Dr. William M. Longhurst, who was a prominent and well known big game researcher. My major professor up at University of Montana happened to be a friend of Bill Longhurst and recommended me for that job.

**John:** Who was that at the University of Montana?

**Guy:** That was Dr. Richard Taber. He was then the big game management instructor in the forestry school at the University of Montana. Soon after I graduated in 1961 he moved to the University of Washington and completed his career there. Anyway, thanks to Dick Taber I was suddenly a candidate for this deer research job and being more interested in big game than waterfowl, I thought I should take that job if I could.

Well based on Dick Taber's recommendation, Dr. Longhurst hired me sight unseen without an interview and suddenly I was going to work for the University of California at the Hopland Field Station, which is in the north coast of California about 100 miles straight north of San Francisco right up U.S. Highway 101. So Helen and I loaded up all our stuff. In those days we could get it all in an U-Haul trailer. We made the drive from Lakeview, Oregon to Hopland in one long hot day, right around Labor Day, 1962 and we went to work there for Bill Longhurst.

The University of California had established the Hopland Field Station by buying a 5,000-acre sheep ranch in 1950.

The station was maintained and run primarily for range sheep management research and related range management studies. Bill Longhurst's wildlife research project was superimposed on top of the sheep and range management stuff. His project was titled "The Relations of Wildlife to Agriculture", and I think it was a little ahead of its time in focusing on the relations between wildlife and agriculture. We did lots of comparative studies there between deer and sheep; what did they eat, how did the food habitats differ, how much did they compete for the same forage, what were the parasite and disease interrelationships, and so on. I loved it there.

This country around Hopland was very foreign to my experience. It was big oak trees with grass understory, a type called Oak Woodland. It's a Mediterranean type of environment with cool, wet winters and hot, dry summers; they didn't really have spring, fall, winter, and summer, they just had a cool/wet season and a hot/dry season.

Six weeks after I came to work there at Hopland, our son was born. When Helen went to the hospital to have David the country was hot and dry, but when she came home a few days later, it suddenly was green because it had rained. And I had a bad poison oak infection because we'd been doing deer feeding experiments involving poison oak, which is very abundant in that country and a real nuisance and a good thing to stay away from. Just a year later, our daughter was born there.

I would have stayed at Hopland with the University for the rest of my life if I had been allowed to. But as things go in big bureaucracies, the University decided after a time to abolish the technician position that I was in. So

after twelve and a half years there I had to hunt another job. In another stroke of luck, which has kind of characterized my whole life, we had started some research at the Hopland Field Station on coyotes and coyote/sheep interactions. We had started that about 1972, just like about 100 other universities and other groups around the U.S., all in the wake of the President Nixon Executive Order of February 1972 that banned the use of predacides, specifically 1080, strychnine, and sodium cyanide, in federal programs and on federal lands.

That's a long complicated story that need not be told here, but one consequence of the ensuing political hassle that erupted big time, was a sudden large increase in federal appropriations for research on predator problems, how to manage them, how to reduce the predation and protect livestock and so on. So the project that Bill Longhurst began at Hopland was just one of many that started as a consequence of this increased funding. I'm sure that the increased predator research funding was an unintended consequence of the Nixon decision and the related EPA order that canceled and banned and suspended the use of those chemicals.

Well, back at the Denver Wildlife Research Center, they similarly got a huge increase in predator research funding. The DWRC predator research budget in fiscal year 1972 was something like \$200,000, but by fiscal year 1974, it was a million dollars or more. So they suddenly were staffing up in a big way to carry out a whole battery of predator studies, which meant there were some new jobs open at the Denver Wildlife Research Center. Since I was job hunting I was naturally interested in those and it turned out I was in a good



position because I had just a little bit of coyote research experience and there weren't very many biologists with coyote experience who were job hunting just then.

Consequently, I was hired to go to work in the Predator Research Group at the Denver Wildlife Research Center. The Predator Section chief at that time was Don Balser. He had the Predator Research organized into three projects. One was called Predator Damage Assessment, it was headed by Roger Nass. This group's assignment was to follow selected bands of sheep all over the country and document the death losses to all causes, including predators. There was another group called Predator Ecology and Behavior, which was headed by Dr. Fred Knowlton at Logan, Utah.

The third project, the one I went to work for, was headed by Sam Linhart, and it was called Depredation Control Methods. This group was working on new ways to keep coyotes and sheep apart, or to reduce the predation however it could be done. So I moved with my family from California to Twin Falls, Idaho, in March/April of 1975. I stayed mostly with the Denver Wildlife Research Center for the rest of my career and I retired at the end of March 1997.

But along the way there was some politics at work, as there usually is with any kind of wildlife management that's controversial. Such that in December 1985, the Congress passed a law or resolution transferring the Animal Damage Control Program, including its research activities, from Fish and Wildlife Service to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, APHIS. This was an interesting time for me, because I happened to be working then in the FWS

Division of Wildlife Research in Washington D.C.

My job was one of only four staff positions in Washington D.C. that transferred to Agriculture with the ADC Program. The four of us FWS biologists who made that transfer were Dr. Russ Reidinger and me on the research side and Gary Simmons and Dick Winters on the operations side. The four of us became the nucleus of the USDA APHIS ADC National Technical Support Staff in Hyattsville, Maryland; that group now is called the OSS or Operational Support Staff.

As I said, being in Washington during that transition was a pretty interesting time to be there. I had only transferred to Washington from Twin Falls, Idaho in October 1985. So I was in an apartment downtown in Washington D.C. and my wife was still back in Idaho. We had our house in Twin Falls up for sale but things were kind of dead there just then and there wasn't much happening in the local real estate market. Anyway, being in Washington by myself I'd go home to Idaho whenever I could manage and I did go to Idaho for Christmas vacation.

Before I left Washington for Christmas, I was talking to Dick Smith and other Fish and Wildlife Service leaders about this possible transfer to USDA that I kept hearing about. Dick and the others said, "Oh no, don't worry about that, it's not going to happen." Well it did happen and whoever these people were in Washington that made it happen, they waited until most of us were out of town for Christmas and then passed the transfer on December 19. So all of a sudden when we came back from Christmas vacation in January, we knew that we were going to work for U.S. Department of Agriculture pretty soon.

And we found out right away who was going to be our new boss over at APHIS. His name was James O. Lee, and like most administrators, he had his good points and his bad points.

**John:** What was his background in APHIS? I mean as Animal Plant Health Inspection Service, I assume it was back then too.

**Guy:** It was.

**John:** But they were; they didn't have any experience with predators I assume.

**Guy:** Well they did not, however, Jim Lee himself had worked for the Predator and Rodent Control, which is what they used to call the ADC Program before 1966. Jim Lee was the State Supervisor, in those days they called it the District Agent, in South Dakota during the 1950s or 60s.

**John:** So do you think that's why he ended up supervising your group because he had some of that experience? That sounds a little bit too logical.

**Guy:** Well I think that experience is what made him interested in it. I don't actually know what his job title or duties were in APHIS just before the transfer. Various people have told me that he was given the assignment to work on getting the transfer accomplished and no other assignment for a year or two before it actually happened.

**John:** Obviously I was in the Fish and Wildlife Service at the time and the transfer was kind of a surprise to everybody. I wonder if you have any information on the motivation and the politics behind it?

**Guy:** Yes, I do. The ADC Program in the Fish and Wildlife Service through the late '70's and early '80's was just kind of drifting along without much incentive to get better or do more than they were doing. So the agricultural forces, the agricultural organizations -- the cattlemen, the sheep men, the rice growers, sunflower producers -- every crop and commodity has its organization and they were very interested in ADC.

There are probably 200 agricultural lobbies if not more. These folks all pressured their Senators and Congressmen to move that program back to Agriculture where it had started. You might recall that the ADC program began way back around 1915 in the Bureau of Biological Survey under USDA and it was transferred out of USDA into Fish and Wildlife Service by executive order around 1939 or '40 in the President Roosevelt days. Some of these political characters had that long view of the situation.

Anybody who thinks about it at all will realize that the relationship between wildlife and agriculture involves a variety of conflicts, and those conflicts can be viewed either as agricultural production problems or wildlife management problems, and of course they are both really. So there's no reason why a wildlife damage management program couldn't be run either by an agriculture agency or a wildlife management agency. And if you take the total history of the Wildlife Services program into account, it has been managed both ways at different times over the years.

I think most of us professional people who were caught up in the transfer in 1986 and had to go to work at Agriculture whether we wanted to or

not, I think most of us to begin with were not really excited about it. We didn't really oppose it. I felt the program should stay in the Fish and Wildlife Service but the Service should do a better job of managing it and being more concerned than they were about wildlife/agricultural problems.

But I know many of my colleagues in the program were very much in favor of the transfer. After it happened, which is the first time any of us took it seriously 'cause we had been told, "Well it's not going to happen, it's a pipedream. We've been talking about this for years; not going to happen."

So, for many of us, the reality only became obvious after the fact. And at that time the people who were really gung ho about the transfer were fairly vocal in expressing their views. But the people who weren't I think were reluctant to talk about it, thinking that might not be the best thing to do career wise. I came to believe within a couple of years that the transfer was a really good thing for the program itself.

One good thing the program did early on was put more effort into wildlife problems other than agricultural damage. When I started with the Denver Wildlife Research Center in 1975, the ADC Program was largely livestock predator control; they didn't do much else. But by 1986, you could see the sheep industry was going down and down, and the goat industry in Texas was going down, cattle production was going down, and you could see that any program like ours that was tied to those livestock production industries, we were bound to go down with those industries. So the new program leadership was very much focused on doing more with other wildlife problems that were out there in the country and still are, such as wildlife

hazards to aircraft and aviation, which now is a really big thrust of the ADC Program in USDA.

Another big recent thrust is the wildlife disease situation -- wildlife diseases transmissible to man. I never could understand back in the '70's when I went to work for ADC Research, why we weren't doing more on wildlife disease because if you look back at the 1931 ADC Act, which is the language mandating the existence of the program and telling it what to do, control of wildlife diseases was as much of a big deal as wildlife damage to agriculture. For whatever reason, as the program developed and built it never went into that disease work at all like they did with predator control to protect livestock and I never could understand that narrow mindedness. Well they're making up for it now; they're doing wildlife disease work in a big way. They're working on invasive species, they do quite a bit of work to protect threatened and endangered wildlife species and probably some other things that I haven't spoken of.

Anyway for me personally, at the time of the transfer, it was an exciting time. The Interior Department had a transition team and USDA had a transition team. I got to know and work with all the people on both of those committees and they were quite different in their approach to things. Usually, when the committees met, the USDA guys would know what the other guys were going to say before they said it. I worked quite a bit on details such as getting the list of names of people together who were actually going to be included in the transfer, and again that was quite interesting.

**John:** So did the Denver, was the Denver Research Center, from the beginning, part of that transfer?

**Guy:** Yes, well the ADC part of the Research Center was included in the transfer. Now the Denver Wildlife Research Center had other activities too. They had a branch, for instance, called Wildlife Ecology on Public Lands; that group stayed with the Fish and Wildlife Service. But the transfer, as far as the Research Center went, was pretty clean because most of the research at DWRC headquarters was ADC related. And all of the field stations, of which there were about six or seven in different places around the country, every field station that did any ADC kind of work, that's all they did. The public lands people or other programs were not officed with the ADC types at the field stations, so it was real obvious which stations would transfer to Agriculture and which wouldn't.

A little confusion arose with a gentleman named Bill Paul in Minnesota. He was one of Fish and Wildlife Service's experts on wolves, and at the time of the transfer he was the main person in Minnesota who was working with wolves and trying to keep the agricultural interests and the preservation interests on the same page, so to speak, as far as having a manageable program; Bill Paul was at Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

When we drew up the first list of people to transfer, his name was not on it. Eventually some of us realized that and we were trying to figure out why he wasn't on there. Well it turns out in the Fish and Wildlife Service bureaucracy, he was part of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center and he was administered through the Regional

Office in Boston, just as many of our personnel things here at the Denver Wildlife Research Center went through the Regional Office in Albuquerque. I don't know any reason why it was that way, it just was. Eventually we figured out where Bill Paul was in the official organization and managed to get him on the list for transfer to USDA.

Then we had some fights with Fish and Wildlife leaders as to whether we could have Bill Paul's old pickups or not; they were pretty worn out anyway. Anyway, we got these little issues resolved.

Most of the people whose jobs were transferred had no choice. Our jobs were going to transfer, and if we had a job with the organization after such and such a time a date, we were in USDA. There were three individuals I know of whose jobs were not slated to transfer initially, but who wanted to go with the transfer. These three people consisted of one in the Washington D.C. office who was my supervisor, Dr. Russ Reidinger, and two scientists out at the Denver Wildlife Research Center, Kathy Fagerstone and Bob Phillips. Kathy and Bob at the time were in the group called Wildlife Ecology on Public Lands; it was headquartered at Fort Collins, and it stayed with Fish and Wildlife Service and remained at Fort Collins.

Anyway, Bob Phillips and Kathy Fagerstone came to various of us who were working with the transition and made their views known that they'd like to come along to ADC. Jim Lee and our other leaders were convinced that we should take them and we did. So those three individuals were really the only ones who had a choice.

We had one lady at headquarters in the operations end of FWS ADC, a secretarial type, with whom there was

some bartering over whether she was going to transfer or not. I won't mention her name because one of my colleagues made a deal with his Fish and Wildlife Service counterpart, who was staying with Fish and Wildlife Service, "Well we'll take her if you give us this big copying machine." That photocopier had just been bought with ADC money. So we did take the copying machine and we took the person and I think she might still be with APHIS. That's one of many humorous incidents that happened along the way. There were some light moments to take off the stress and strain of it all.

I still remember our very first week on the job at USDA. It was the first full week of March, 1986. There was a big professional ADC meeting going on in California that week, the California Vertebrate Pest Conference. And I was on the agenda to give a paper there on some of the research work I'd been doing. But our new boss in APHIS, Jim Lee, decreed that that first week we had to have a big meeting at the APHIS office in Minneapolis, which was a big administrative support center. We had to meet there to start getting used to the APHIS way of doing things.

One feature of the APHIS system that Mr. Lee said we were going to be briefed on was the new paperless system that was coming soon. Well here it is 24 years later and they still don't have a paperless system. We've got more paper than ever. So that was just a mirage that Jim Lee was talking about and I don't think he knew how to bring about a paperless system any more than the rest of us, but I do remember that was one of the buzz words of the moment.

I also remember, since I was slated to give a talk at this California meeting in San Diego the same week

that we were meeting in Minneapolis, I had to go to Minneapolis from Washington D.C. and spend a day or two there, then fly to San Diego and give my paper out there. In San Diego I also had to deliver Jim Lee's keynote address at the Vertebrate Press Conference, which I also helped him write. And then it was back to Minneapolis to finish out the week of meetings there. So it was a busy time; a lot of running around. That Minneapolis trip seemed kind of pointless because a lot of us were there who really didn't need to be. I didn't feel like we really learned all that much that week about how to do things in APHIS; it took most of us longer than that.

I remember the first time I had to get an airplane ticket to go somewhere on official business after we were in APHIS. I mentioned before that I was part of this group out in Hyattsville, Maryland called the NTSS, the National Technical Support Staff. Well we were in a big building there that was all APHIS people, mostly long time APHIS employees, and we were kind of the new kids on the block. The old hands were doing their best to help us get organized on how to do things in APHIS.

So I had to buy a plane ticket. A certain lady in another branch of APHIS was identified to me as one who dealt with travel and knew all about it. I went to ask her, you know, how do we get plane tickets when we have to go someplace. Her name was Pinky Irving, very good employee, good colleague. She said, "Well you have to have a travel authorization. Do you have one?" I said, "Yeah I have one." "Well let me see it," she said.

Jim Lee had fixed all of his staff members up with blanket travel authorizations, so I got mine and showed

it to Pinky. She looked at that and her eyes got wide and her mouth dropped open. She looked at me and she looked at that paper, she looked at me again and said, "This is an A authorization! Are you a regional director?" I said, "Oh no better, I'm a wildlife biologist." She said, "Oh, you're not allowed to have an A authorization." And being not too astute on bureaucratic technicalities, I said "Well why not, it looks good to me. It authorizes me to go wherever I need to go, whenever I need to go." "Well that's just it, you can't do that; not at your level, oh no."

Well my colleague at the NTSS, Gary Simmons, saw that I was getting in hot water with this lady and so he came running over to shore up my defenses a little bit. Then another lady saw that Pinky was being ganged up on so she came running over to Pinky's defense. Anyway, we resolved to stand down until we could get the right travel authorization and proceed, and we did and it worked out fine.

This APHIS building I've spoken about at Hyattsville, Maryland was a really a big building. It was one that the government leased right by a shopping center in Hyattsville. The subway didn't go there. I had an apartment in downtown Washington, only about three or four blocks from the White House, but I couldn't get to Hyattsville on the subway. I had selected my apartment location with respect to the Fish and Wildlife Service office which was in the Matomic building, 1717 H Street, on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor, just a couple blocks from the White House. This was right down the street from Serenade Records; a good place to be. My apartment was at Scott Circle, just up 16<sup>th</sup> Street from the White House, right around the corner from the National Education Association, which

had the biggest, healthiest rats I saw anywhere in Washington D.C.

I went to work for APHIS out in Hyattsville starting in March of '86. By then I knew I'd return to Idaho pretty soon so I didn't want to move again. So I started taking the bus to work. It turned out there was a bus that ran right by my apartment building and went to that federal building at Hyattsville. It was about an hour's ride each way, although it was only about eight miles, ten miles perhaps. The only time I drove my car out there was my last day when I was loading up all my stuff to go back to Idaho.

As I mentioned before, in January 1986 we came back to Washington D.C. from Christmas vacation and suddenly knew we were going to work for Agriculture. It wasn't going to happen officially for a couple of months but right away we got acquainted with our boss in Agriculture and started meeting with him to talk about all the details that needed attention. Well by 1986 I had been in Predator Research at the Denver Wildlife Research Center for about 10 years, and I had quite a number of western state directors in the ADC Program that I was on good terms with. They liked the research I'd been doing more than what some of the other researchers were doing.

These westerners lobbied Jim Lee to send me back to research. So within a couple of weeks after I first met Mr. Lee, he called me into his office and said, "I've been getting a lot of pressure to send you back to research. You want to go to back out there?" I told him, "Well, yeah, sure I'd like to go." By then I'd seen a lot of Washington. I knew I could live there, I liked it fine, but I was ready to leave. He said, "Well, I don't mean that we want to get rid of

you, we've got plenty of work for you to do here, but these guys really want you back in research and I'd like to send you there if you want to go." And I said, "Yes, I would like to do that."

So Mr. Lee said, "Well fine, you can stay here as long as you want. You just decide when you want to go back, and draft up a memo from me to you ordering you back to the Denver Wildlife Research Center. Just bring it in here and I'll sign it." I did, and he signed it. He didn't bother asking the people at the Denver Wildlife Research Center, "You want this guy back?" Oh no, he just told them, "He's coming back, make room."

Well I thought it over and talked to my wife about it; she was still back in Idaho. And right away I told her to take down the 'For Sale' sign on our house because we still hadn't anybody even come look at it. Up till that moment I thought we were gone to Washington D.C. and so did she. But she had a job at the local junior college and we decided that she should finish out her year there, and then when she's free for the summer she can come out and be a tourist in Washington for a few weeks and then we'll drive back across the country together. I wrote up my memo and took it into Jim Lee. It said something like, "Guy Connolly is transferred back to the DWRC at Twin Falls, Idaho, effective June 1986". Mr. Lee signed it and that's what we did.

I actually worked at Hyattsville for only about 3 months and was traveling some of that time. About the first of June I loaded up my stuff in the car I had brought out there from Idaho; I had driven out in October 1985. And Helen and I drove back together. We decided then the country is great to drive across but it looks better when you're

heading west. Back in Twin Falls, Idaho I resumed my research on predator control things.

I will mention, if I can back up a little bit, that when I first joined the DWRC in 1975, my assignment was to work on something called the livestock protection collar, or toxic collar. This is a collar that goes on a sheep and it has a toxicant inside. Any coyote that comes along and attacks that sheep at the neck is going to bite that collar and poison itself and that'll be its last sheep. I was very keen on this idea because here at last was a method that gets the individual doing the damage and no other individual.

I was aware that for many years there had been groups out in the country that opposed Animal Damage Control work and Predator and Rodent Control. They objected to the blanket killing of coyotes. And one of their things was, they wanted the control work to be directed more specifically to the individual animals causing damage. Well this is it: the Livestock Protection Collar. It had been invented by a Texan named Roy McBride. At the time he invented it, around 1968 or '69, he was a Fish and Wildlife Service employee -- a technician with the Denver Wildlife Research Center working for Fred Knowlton.

**John:** And he was out in west Texas as I recall, 'cause he worked, when I was; I worked on the survey of mammals in Guadalupe Mountains National Park, and he was known as the cat guy; the cougar guy.

**Guy:** Yeah, yeah he was a very experienced predator hunter, wolves and cats.

**John:** Used dogs as I recall.

**Guy:** Yeah, had hounds; he lived in Alpine.

**John:** That's right.

**Guy:** Alpine, Texas and I think still does. Anyway Roy had invented this and he had used 1080 in it; he'd had some collars made up by hand, actually they were lambskin sheaths with wool on the outside and a rubber bladder inside, like a small hot water bottle, holding the toxicant. He had advanced the collar to Fish & Wildlife Service managers as a suggestion that should be developed by the DWRC, and there was only lukewarm acceptance of this to begin with. But after the Nixon predacide ban, all of a sudden we're looking around for new, more selective methods. And in general we're looking for any kind of new technology to protect livestock with minimal adverse impact on the wildlife that was doing the damage, and of course on the environment including non-target species. Well this collar began looking better and better, so by the time I came to work for the Center, they were already committed to working on it. Sam Linhart and Ray Sterner and some others had already done some pen studies.

When I went to work at the DWRC in 1975, my assignment was to get with it and develop this collar. At that time we weren't allowed to use 1080 in it. Compound 1080 turned out to be kind of a boogie man; it's an odd compound in many ways. It was widely misunderstood, both by the sheep men who were enthusiastic about its use, and by preservationists who were dead set against its use. The preservation people

thought the non-target hazards of it were much worse than they actually are. The sheep ranchers thought it was much more effective than it really was.

So when I started work on the collar, the first thing I asked was, "Well what toxicant are we going to use in it? The obvious one is compound 1080 because it is odorless and tasteless, the coyote will voluntarily bite the collar and take a lethal dose of that toxicant, not knowing he's getting it."

I was told, "Oh no, we can't do that". Nothing would do but we had to test it first with sodium cyanide. Now sodium cyanide is a whole different proposition than Compound 1080. As a human user of these toxicants, if you make a mistake with sodium cyanide, you're probably dead in three minutes. With 1080, there's no symptoms at all for a couple hours. You have time to get medical treatment or something if you should be so dumb as to drink a dose of 1080 liquid, which is really the only way you could injure yourself with it because it's not dermally absorbed to any extent.

Anyway, those of us who knew anything about coyotes knew that sodium cyanide would never be the chemical of choice based on any kind of logic. Nevertheless that was the assignment, we're going to test sodium cyanide in the collar, so we did that. We campaigned through Montana and North Dakota in the summer of 1975 with collars with sodium cyanide in them. That was not a good thing, we never killed any coyotes at all with it. The rules on controlling these experiments, you know, keeping track of the sheep, were really extreme because those collars were really dangerous. One collar had as much sodium cyanide in it as 200 M44 capsules. It can be handled safely but you know it just wasn't in the cards



to ever get that to the point of a practical field tool.

As I say, we never killed any coyotes with it. We actually got a few coyotes to bite them and I think the coyotes were detecting the adverse taste or smell, because sodium cyanide solution is much like lye - sodium hydroxide. It's very corrosive and doesn't taste good. So if the coyotes would get a whiff or a little taste, they'd just back off from the lamb and go on their way and wouldn't be adversely affected. Now Ray Sterner and Sam had killed a coyote or two with cyanide collars in pens here at the Denver Federal Center when they were in the early development stages, but we never could kill one at all in the field. So we quit the sodium cyanide collar campaign as soon as we could after one field season.

The next year, 1976, I had hoped we would get to use 1080 by then, but no we couldn't. So we did a series of field tests with an anticoagulant, diphacinone, which some of our colleagues at the Center had developed back in the '60's for use in controlling vampire bats in Central America; it was a very effective and good chemical for that. Diphacinone nowadays is used quite a lot as a rodenticide, it's an anticoagulant. Most people don't know to this day that it's deadly on dogs - canines are highly susceptible to it. So from that standpoint, it was a good candidate for the collar.

We did some field tests with it and pen tests of course, and we found that it worked okay except that diphacinone, being an anticoagulant, takes a long time to become effective. In fact we found through controlled experiments that in our pens over at Logan, Utah, that when a coyote bit one

of those collars and got a lethal dose of diphacinone, it took him about a week to die and for most of that week he was behaving normally including killing more sheep if that's what he'd been doing. So the practical result of that was that we couldn't make it work effectively in the field because the coyotes just kept coming back and killing more livestock until they finally got sick and died. The bottom line was that we couldn't measure the effectiveness of what we were doing with that slow-acting chemical. Eventually we got to test Compound 1080 in the collar. After years of work, we did get EPA approval to use 1080 in that mode of application and the collar still is registered for that use.

**John:** Is it being used much these days?

**Guy:** Not very much. It's used a little, in Texas more than anywhere else. In recent years, it's been used a little in New Mexico, West Virginia, and Virginia. They've been talking about it in Ohio but I don't know if they've ever used any. It has never been used as much as it could be and I think should be.

**John:** Is there much difference in the actual construction of the collar these days? Has it evolved much or is it still very similar to the original ones that you saw?

**Guy:** Well the original ones that they had at the DWRC when I came to work in '75 were big, kind of like a life preserver looking thing; they covered up the whole neck of the sheep. We quickly got down to a much simpler and smaller configuration. By the time we started testing with 1080 in 1978, the

collar was about six inches long and two inches wide with Velcro neck straps. The Velcro neck straps were a key part of making the thing effective, we found out as we went along.

Roy McBride had been using elastic straps, like underwear waist-band elastic. They were quicker and easier to put on the sheep, but after several years of field experience we found that the elastic straps weren't very good. Our records showed, when coyotes attacked the collars, if they attacked the Velcro strap ones we killed most of those coyotes, whereas most coyotes that bit elastic-strap collars got away. We think it's because, when the coyote bit down on the collar, the elastic strap ones would slip away from under his teeth, whereas the Velcro actually got tangled in the lamb's wool and really held that collar in place so it couldn't slip away as the coyote bit it.

**John:** That makes sense.

**Guy:** So a lot of experience went into perfecting the collar design that eventually came into production and use. The collar manufacturing technology was perfected by McBride and to this day he is the sole manufacturer of the collars and always has been.

The Velcro strap idea was one of the innovations that came from our research group. Another minor innovation that we made at the DWRC, and that Roy adopted as part of the design, was the two-compartment configuration. If the coyote bites just one compartment, no toxicant is released from the other compartment. So there's that much less toxicant released into the environment.

We did all kinds of studies of hazards and eventually we wore down

the EPA or they wore us down, I don't know which, but it took years and years to get the collar registered (approved for use). It was a really tough thing and very expensive, and I don't know to this day if it was really worth it.

I think it was worth it from the standpoint that here we finally had a technique that really got at the offending, damaging coyote and no other, which was kind of a cherished goal of mine from the beginning. We did get that but, to my disappointment, the conservation groups wouldn't accept the collar with that bad old 1080. And I came to believe, if we were to develop some other toxicant, they would find reasons to oppose that one too. They weren't really interested in having a truly effective tool that killed any coyotes, even the target ones.

And I felt that we on the research side of this picture were at quite a disadvantage because the political action groups could think up ways to obstruct and oppose things a lot faster than we could come up with new ones.

Through the process of getting the collar registered, I felt I really earned my money one week when I was the Interior Department's chief witness at formal EPA adjudicatory hearings on the 1080 Livestock Protection Collar. These hearings were like a court trial with lawyers representing both sides. The hearings were just part of EPA's deliberations on whether they could approve the 1080 collar.

These hearings took place in 1982 in Washington D.C. The Fish and Wildlife Service had started the process by formally petitioning EPA to register the collar. Our registration application described the product, explained how it would work, identified potential hazards, and proposed use restrictions to

minimize those hazards. EPA then had to consider whether they could rescind that 1972 ban, or roll it back sufficiently to permit the use of 1080 collars.

In this hearing process, political action groups on both sides of the predator control issue were able to come in and present their views and their briefs and have their lawyers cross examination everybody. These same hearings also considered another use of 1080, in single lethal dose coyote baits. My project had done some research such baits and I was not interested in trying to register them because I didn't see how we could ever deliver them effectively and selectively to coyotes. In our research, most of the baits we placed were taken by mice and other animals rather than coyotes.

**John:** And if, I assume, if you were interested again in specific animals that were doing damage...

**Guy:** This isn't it.

**John:** ...not too specific.

**Guy:** Well you could have some specificity by your placement of baits in relation to where predation was occurring, but there's other coyotes there too that aren't doing damage. And the young dumb coyotes are the most likely ones to take those baits, whereas the wise older coyotes are the ones doing the killing and they're less likely to take the bait. With the livestock protection collar on the other hand, it doesn't offer a learning experience. Any old, smart coyote comes up there and tackles a lamb and bites that collar, he kills the lamb just like he normally would, he goes ahead and feeds on it, then he goes away and dies; that's the end of him. So

I was keen on getting the collar registered because of the selective delivery plus the non-target hazards and the human hazards were very low. And all that was very apparent from all of our records and all the testing that we had done.

But when it came to the EPA hearings I started to talk about a moment ago, in 1982, I was cross examined on the stand for three days. The transcript of my cross examination was about 450 pages. EPA had four lawyers there, USDI had one representing us (Fish and Wildlife Service), the Livestock Industry had one, the Humane Society of the U.S. had one, Defenders of Wildlife had one, so there was more anti lawyers than there were pro lawyers. These hearings went on for a long time, they had something like 80 witnesses in total; I don't think any of the rest them were up there as long as I was, but it was very thorough. At the end EPA came out with a decision and it turned out that Fish and Wildlife Service was the only party that got what it asked for. Everybody else, the livestock people and the anti's, they did not get everything they asked for; Interior came out better than all the rest of them in terms of results in relation to what our application was and what our testimony was.

So there was kind of a moral victory or something, but it was a small victory because EPA tried to stick more use restrictions on us to the point that the tool would have been unusable in any practical sense. And after the hearings in 1982 there were endless delays. There were decisions, there were appeals, there final decisions that turned out not to be final. EPA finally approved our registration in 1985, but even then no collars were actually used under that registration until 1988.

So it was a long, hard fight for what appears to me now to have been kind of minor results just in terms of the economics of damage prevented versus the cost of all the negotiation and research that went into it. I don't think the collar saved as many dollars' worth of sheep and goats as the value of all the effort we put out, but I still think it was worth doing. And in a sense it was a victory for research and science over superstition and politics.

**John:** And this whole process started back in the mid '70's or so when you were working for FWS, and then it was after the transfer to USDA and after you had gone back to research that finally they actually started using them.

**Guy:** Yes. One reason our program never used the collar as much as I think they should is that I was pulled off that research before it was done. We should have proceeded into some pilot field trials involving ADC operations more than we did. Now the operations folks helped with the research all the way through, we could have never done it without them. And I still remember back in the late '70's it was difficult as a researcher with the ADC Program to find good places to test predation control methods. Of course we were trying to tangle with coyotes that were doing damage. In spite of all the hue and cry we were hearing in those years about bad coyotes killing livestock, it was really hard to find a place where there was significant predation going on; harder than you would ever have guessed until you tried to find a research site where you could put livestock protection collars in the field and test them under real world conditions.

**John:** Have enough actually predation...

**Guy:** Have enough predation to give it a try, yeah, sure. You can go out there and mill around and the coyotes will stay away, but that's really not proof of the method you were trying to test.

Anyway, a while earlier I intended to say that the ADC Program, within Fish and Wildlife Service and now in USDA APHIS, runs state by state. It's a series of state programs.

**John:** Right.

**Guy:** And, back in the '70's, the willingness of people in the program to cooperate with research varied a lot from state to state. Some state directors had had bad experiences with certain researchers and they didn't want any more of it. Others were more open and welcoming. Wyoming was pretty closed to research at that time.

**John:** I found, not specifically the same, but as a Regional Migratory Bird Chief, you know, I worked with state directors. I had eight different states, though some like North and South Dakota were combined under one director. But I found quite a bit of variability in my ability to get along with them. I got , along great with some state directors and had a good relationship, but others didn't want to talk to you.

**Guy:** Exactly. That's the way it was if you were in predator research too. See I had come back to the DWRC from the University of California, which in those years had a world class extension service with agriculture extension agents in every county. Out there if you needed to find a ranch where coyotes were killing sheep you'd go to the county agent and

he'd get you in touch with them and you'd get organized that way. So when I came to the Center in 1975, I was focused outwardly, as far as finding places to do work, rather than inwardly. But I found out right away if you're trying to deal with coyotes killing livestock, that the ADC operations people are the ones who know where those places are. And so I could not do any kind of field test, in any state, without their cooperation. In Idaho they were somewhat open to it; Montana somewhat open to it.

But I was pleasantly surprised when I went to Texas, along the east edge of the Edward Plateau, in the ADC Fort Worth District. I was out on this particular ranch that a Texas agricultural extension agent had identified as a possible research site. The first time I went down there to meet with him and the ranchers and the ADC people to see what we might be able to do, the District Supervisor and his people from Fort Worth came out and they said, "Well, we understand you might need a little help from us. If there's something you need us to do, just let us know, we'll do it."

Well that was a thunderbolt, I'd never had that kind of invitation from ADC operations before. A couple days later I was in the state office in San Antonio and there was a brand new state director and assistant state director there. Don Hawthorne was the State Director, Gary Nunley the Assistant State director, and they said practically the same words; I couldn't believe it: "If you need some help just let us know what you need and we'll do it."

And they did. We did need help and they did provide it; if they hadn't we wouldn't have gotten anywhere. So at that time Texas was more open than

most of the other western states to participate in research. Part of the reason is that they operated as part of the Texas Agricultural Extension Service, so they were in with the extension people and they were just had little more receptive to research. Of course maybe their prior experience with Fred Knowlton, the DWRC coyote researcher stationed down there since 1964, had helped promote a positive attitude about research, too.

Over the years this was one thing we had to work on all the time -- relations with the operations people and ranchers. It's kind of a challenge, you're going out to field test something, you know you have to have something that's worth these people's time. These people are busy. If you come out there with some kind of a jack in the box that's really not going to amount anything, it's not worthy of their effort. And so we tried to avoid confronting them with that kind of situation as much as we could. But you can't always do this in research. The sodium cyanide collar was a good example of a concept that wasn't worth ranchers' or ADC specialists' time and we should have never have wasted their time with it. We didn't test the sodium cyanide collar in Texas; we did most of that in North Dakota and Montana.

Well anyway, over the years it became more cool for ADC operations people to cooperate with research and now in the program it's really the thing to do.

**John:** Listening to this, you know, through my career, there's a parallel with refuge managers and research. In my whole career I kind of sat on the fence, you know, having done some research myself. Actually through all the years, I was a refuge biologist ten

years, I continued to do some research and a lot of it was in cooperation with either co-op units (Cooperative Wildlife Research Units) or someone else. But it was like two different cultures that you had to constantly work at, like you said, get them together and say “Hey these researchers can provide you with some information that will be valuable for management.” And the research folks, you know, they didn’t want to come out with practical management recommendations based on their research that the managers could apply. And basically what I told them was, “You’re in applied research and if your research doesn’t get applied, you haven’t done your job.” And so I tried to get the managers and the researchers to come half way and work together, sometimes successfully, sometimes not.

**Guy:** Sure. Well that’s the same deal that we were and still are up against. That’s the nature of it, and given all the variety of human nature and human interests out in the world, I don’t know that you can expect it to be any different or would want it to be any different. All I know is that over time I came to have a much better relation with the operations part of the program and sheep producers than most of our other researchers. I had one rancher in Texas tell me, “If it wasn’t for you working on this project, I wouldn’t allow anybody from Interior on my place.” And he had good reason to feel that way.

We’re kind of getting off the subject here as far as what my own career amounted to or didn’t. Earlier I pretty well covered the transfer to Agriculture. What happened to me personally after I made the great escape from Washington D.C. in 1986 and went back to Idaho, I hung on there in Twin

Falls as long as I could. I really didn’t want to move to Denver but I had verbally agreed to that when they sent me back from Washington to the DWRC. We made a deal that I’d go back to Idaho first and then come to Denver later.

Eventually I did move to Denver, in 1989, and that was pretty much the end of my research career. My job at DWRC headquarters was Liaison Officer, in the director’s office. I was supposed to serve as the information go between from research to operations and back and forth.

On paper that’s what it was, but in reality it wasn’t quite like that. I was actually just an odd job guy to be put out on special projects as needed. And a big part of my work from 1987, when I was still in Idaho, and continuing after I transferred to Denver in 1989, was to help get the ADC programmatic environmental impact statement done. This was a huge project and there’s many funny stories along the way. But to me that was just the longest trouble shooting assignment there ever was. It lasted seven years, from 1987 to 1994.

This EIS project actually started in 1986 with the ADC program transfer to USDA. I remember having a talk with our new leader, Jim Lee, in February 1986, when I suggested that to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, we’re going to have to prepare some kind of an environmental document on the program now that it’s going to be in APHIS. I recommended that we publish a Federal Register notice, formally adopting the Fish and Wildlife Service ADC Program EIS, which had been completed in 1979, and saying it’s going to be the APHIS ADC NEPA document until we can prepare a new one. So that notice was published

in February of '86, and then the program leaders apparently forgot about it and proceeded with other work.

Well about 14 months later, in April 1987, Jim Lee was put out of the ADC Program and we had an interim deputy administrator for ADC come in until another one could be selected from the ADC program. At this time someone high up in APHIS noticed that the ADC program had made no progress toward that EIS we'd promised back in February '86. So the ADC National Technical Support Staff in Hyattsville was directed to get started on that project.

Somewhere along the way it had been decided that APHIS would contract with an outside group to prepare the EIS rather than doing it in house. Well there's pros and cons either way, as you well know. I don't think you want the big story about the EIS here, but it turned out to be a big job just getting the contract awarded. And then we found that the contractor really didn't know beans about doing EIS's, all they were good at was mining money from the government. We wound up having to do most of the document ourselves.

**John:** In house anyway.

**Guy:** Yes. I was part of a Technical Review Group, 5 or 6 people appointed from the Program, and this group wound up doing most of the work on it. I remember what a breakthrough it was when we negotiated an agreement with the contractor that we could do the work as long we paid them as if they had done it! They hadn't got much done up to that point. They had a three dollar calculator that didn't add up numbers right; that gave us a lot of trouble. All kind of trivial stuff like that got in the way.

The Final EIS finally was published in 1994. So working on that was a big part of my job, even though it was extra duty, from 1987 to 1994. The Technical Review Group that had worked on it all that time, we got cash awards for doing good work. It was good -- not the most wonderful EIS, but it was a whole lot better than the 1979 one, which was our previous reference point.

At the time we started on the new EIS, those of us who were biologists and not NEPA experts, we came into the job with the concept that once we completed this programmatic EIS, this would be all of the NEPA the program would have to do for a while. The reason we had that belief was our experience with the 1979 one, which I had also worked on. After we completed that one in 1979 it met all of our NEPA needs up until we transferred into Agriculture; we didn't have to do anything else.

Now the situation is much different. We've got all kinds of environmental documents for the ADC Program (well I keep calling it ADC but it's Wildlife Services now). They have an Environmental Manager at the headquarters plus five or six people in the field who do nothing but help district supervisors and state directors prepare NEPA documents of whatever scope and variety they need at the moment. We have a guy up at Billings, Montana that does that, another one in Portland, Oregon, one in Wisconsin, had one in Albuquerque, I don't think we do now. (I keep saying we, but I retired 12 years ago. Old habits die hard.)

**John:** It's all family.

**Guy:** Anyway, the NEPA and environmental documentation business

sucks up a lot more taxpayer dollars now than it did back then, and more than we ever expected it would or should. We had lots of internal fights with a group in APHIS called BBEP (Biologics, Biotechnology and Environmental Protection, I think it was). This group was actually responsible for all NEPA compliance APHIS wide. And our first introduction to them when we started on our EIS project was a meeting to which we were summoned. There we were told that we needed to publish a federal register notice pretty quick and announce we were getting on with this EIS and saying here's some details about the alternatives we're going to consider. And I remember us ADC guys at this meeting talking about writing our own federal register notice. Other APHIS insiders were just chuckling and carrying on about the ridiculousness of doing our own work; apparently the APHIS way was to get somebody else to do it.

But we went from that initial meeting to a final EIS, as I said, in seven years. It shouldn't have taken that long but it did and there we are; we're done with it. I think it might be to the point where ADC needs a new one now, 16 years after we finished the programmatic one in 1994. At the time we completed that, there was a regulation, I think an APHIS regulation, requiring these documents to be reviewed every five years and updated as necessary. And since I retired in '97, and I was glad to forget about that kind of stuff, I haven't tracked what they have done since then except that I know the people in those environmental documentation jobs; I'm personal friends with some of them.

**John:** I know some, not all, but some of the states where the state directors were doing environmental assessments on

their state programs in the last few years. There was an EIS, actually I think it started with an environmental assessment, then went to an EIS that I don't think ever was finalized, on blackbird control to protect sunflowers up in the Dakotas. I can't remember, they might have called that a programmatic EIS for black bird control, but obviously it wasn't a Wildlife Services- or ADC-wide kind of programmatic document.

**Guy:** Yes. One could argue now that the program has expanded in so many areas it may no longer be acceptable to cover the entire program in a single NEPA document. Like you just mentioned, they're much bigger now. Just consider the scope of the black bird /sunflower arena, rice depredation by black birds down south, or the bird/aircraft hazard business. Perhaps each of those programs could merit its own EIS and, for all I know, they may have them.

**John:** So you spent a lot of time up until about '94 working on that thing.

**Guy:** Yeah.

**John:** What were you doing from then on until you retired?

**Guy:** Well...

**John:** Were you still doing this kind of 'other duties as assigned'?

**Guy:** Yeah, one of the other duties that came up after that was supervising the Pocatello Supply Depot. Now it might never occur to you that somebody here in Lakewood would all of a sudden be tapped to supervise a manufacturing



plant six or seven hundred miles away, whatever it is, in Idaho. But you know about the Pocatello Supply Depot, and you know they make specialized baits and things that the program needs that can't be obtained elsewhere.

**John:** That's also where our eagle repository was before we moved it to Denver.

**Guy:** Right, that was...

**John:** That's what I know the most about it.

**Guy:** ...it was a happy day when that eagle feather business moved away from the Pocatello Supply Depot.

**John:** That was a difficult business.

**Guy:** Yeah for sure. Well I had been pretty aware of the Depot all along, ever since I moved to Twin Falls, Idaho in 1975. Pocatello is about 120 miles east of Twin Falls.

The Pocatello Supply Depot has been in the same building where it is now ever since about 1939. Its construction was authorized by a special act of Congress called the Game Management Supply Depot Act. Before that, it originated as a bait mixing station out at McCammon, Idaho which is like 30 miles south of Pocatello. And the bait mixing station, and later the Pocatello Supply Depot, were first supervised by Paul T. Quick, who later became a regional director in the Fish and Wildlife Service. I think he was Regional Director in Portland when I started work at the Bison Range in 1959. Anyway, I have in my files here, a complete list of the managers at the

Depot and their years of tenure and so on.

When I first visited the Depot in 1975, a guy named Ade Zajanc was the manager. He was soon replaced by Jerry Bean, who previously was a physical science technician here at the DWRC. Though he was manager, you don't need that kind of a background to run the Depot.

**John:** I would be interested in that list of...

**Guy:** Oh okay.

**John:**...managers for the archives. One of the special projects that I've worked on was compiling a list of all the refuge managers in the system from day one. And this kind of thing is real popular with the archives; we're now trying to do hatchery managers. I did it for Region 6, which included some of the stations like the Bison Range were a part of Region 1 and then transferred to Region 6. And the Dakotas were part of Region 3 and so on, so some of those lists go back. But we would be interested in that manager list for the archives.

**Guy:** Yeah, of course compared to your list of refuge managers, this will be quite short.

**John:** But, you know, it's still a good historical...

**Guy:** Oh very much so. Well I became interested in the Depot early on because they manufacture the M-44 and the M-44 sodium cyanide capsules. This is one of the most important coyote killing tools the program has. It's had chronic problems over the years.

During my years of monkeying with the livestock protection collar and other things, I was always trying to figure out what research I could do that would give the most immediate payoff in terms of helping the ADC program work better on the ground. Well fixing that cyanide ejector was kind of an obvious one. And I'm proud to say that I was able to accomplish that with a whole bunch of help from other people. That was the final thing that I did back in Twin Falls just before I was transferred here to Denver, was fix that M44 cyanide capsule so that that the cyanide contents would in dry powder form like it needs to be when the coyote comes along and pulls it. The capsule improvements developed in our research were implemented at the Depot in 1989.

One thing I did later, when I was working here at the DWRC as liaison officer, was an analysis after several years with the new and improved cyanide capsule to see if it really did work better than the old one. I wound up giving a paper on this at the Vertebrate Pest Conference in 1996. My analysis showed that in five or six years since we had adopted the new and improved capsule the program was taking a lot more coyotes and they were using fewer capsules than before. I showed that, just in terms of efficiency, the capsule fix was saving the program something like 80 thousand dollars a year, which I thought was significant. So that is one thing that I really took satisfaction in.

But back to the Depot, if you think about everything the Wildlife Services Program does, there's not another manufacturing plant like the Depot anywhere else in the Program. Years ago there were other supply depots around the country -- at East

Lafayette, Indiana; San Antonio, Texas; one up in South Dakota some place, Sturgis maybe, and others. Anyway, by the time I came in 1975, Pocatello was the only one. Well that's okay being that this is a manufacturing business and the program does not do that any place else.

The Depot has always been kind of an odd duck administratively and often it's misunderstood by people that don't know much about it. One of the problems from the beginning has been, who supervises it? Over the years they've tried just every kind of supervision that could possibly be thought of. It was supervised from the Washington office, it was supervised from Region 1 in Portland, it was supervised by the Western Regional Director, it was supervised by the Idaho State Director as it is now, and it was supervised for a time by the Denver Wildlife Research Center, which I don't think really is where it ought to be.

After thinking about it quite a bit over the years, it seems to me that the Depot ought to be supervised by the Operational Support staff in Washington D.C. The OSS is responsible for the technical excellence of the program. The Depot doesn't serve just Idaho, it doesn't serve the West, it serves the whole country.

The product they make the most of and amounts to the biggest share of their revenue in dollars is a gas cartridge that's used mostly in the east to kill woodchucks in their dens. And I think that's still the big item. I was not interested in that particularly, I was interested in the M-44. Over the years I've researched the history of the M-44, and before that the coyote getter, a whole bunch.

So with that background on the Depot, I can explain that there came a

time in the 90's when the DWRC Director was supervising the Depot. Well of course the DWRC Director wasn't going to supervise it personally. He assigned that duty to Ed Schafer for a while. I don't know if you know Ed Schafer but he was the supervisor of the DWRC Chemistry Group for a long time and in his later years he became the person doing all the paperwork with EPA on pesticide registrations.

**John:** And who was the center director at that time? Do you remember?

**Guy:** Well up until about '92 or '93, it was Russ Reidinger.

**John:** Okay.

**Guy:** Let me back up a little bit.

**John:** Okay.

**Guy:** At the time of the ADC program transfer to USDA in March 1986, the Center Director was Paul Vohs.

**John:** Right, okay I know Paul.

**Guy:** Okay, I had met him in the 1970s when he was at Oregon State University.

**John:** Right.

**Guy:** Anyway, Paul was the director until right after the transfer. And for whatever reason he did not get along well with Jim Lee or some of the state directors who were Jim Lee's main cronies and supporters in the new program in APHIS. So Paul was put aside. Russ Reidinger came in as acting director and soon was made Director. Meanwhile Paul job-hunted for about six months and then became Co-Op Unit

Leader in Iowa. And I think later he transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service editorial office in Fort Collins and he retired from there.

**John:** I think that's right.

**Guy:** And he still lives in Fort Collins. Anyway Paul Vohs was DWRC Director at the time of the transfer, then it was Russ Reidinger until about '92, then it was nobody for a year and then it was Dick Curnow.

**John:** Okay, I know Dick too.

**Guy:** Dick is retired now; he lives out in the country, 20 or 30 miles up the Poudre River out of Fort Collins. I've never been to his place. So Dick Curnow was actually the director when the DWRC was assigned to supervise the Pocatello Supply Depot. Ed Schafer was put on that duty for two years. Then Dr. Curnow wanted somebody else to do it so he stuck me in that assignment for a year. By the time my year was up the responsibility for supervising the Depot had been reassigned to the Western Regional Director, Mike Worthen. Mike then negotiated with Dick Curnow to have me continue doing it under his direction for a while. So I think I supervised the Depot manager for a couple of years.

Then at the beginning of 1997, I was getting ready to retire. At this time Mike Worthen made a deal with the Idaho State Director, Mark Collins, to take over supervising the Depot. To compensate for this added duty, Mark received another position, an Assistant State Director, which he did get and still has; that gentleman's name is George Graves. He's a good person.

But back to the Depot history, the manager from 1983 till 1989 was Paul Edstrom, who had been a staff biologist in Washington D.C. before he transferred out to Pocatello. Before that he'd been a district supervisor in the program up in Washington, and I don't know where else. Anyway Paul was the manager until 1989, then Joe Packham became the manager. Joe was one of the guys who'd been all around USFWS and the ADC program his whole career. You've heard of him and perhaps know him; he's retired in Boise now, I believe, last I heard he was. Anyway Joe had been the number one leader of the program back in Washington during 1989-1992.

The top Wildlife Services manager is the APHIS Deputy Administrator for Wildlife Services. His counterpart Deputy Administrators head the other divisions of APHIS: Plant Protection and Quarantine, Veterinary Services, and so on. Joe Packham was the Deputy Administrator for ADC. In 1992 he wanted to come back to Idaho. So he was just allowed to transfer to Pocatello and keep his GS 15 grade and manage the Depot for two years and then retire.

When Joe retired there was an assistant manager who Paul Edstrom had hired: Don Despain. Don was promoted to PSD Manager but that didn't work out very well. So by the time I began supervising the Depot in 1995 we had two federal positions at the Depot – Don Despain, Manager, and Sherm Blom, Control Methods Specialist. Sherm was an expert on lures and attractants, and all kinds of ADC field methods; he was a very good fit for that job.

When Joe was manager there were 3 Federal positions, but when Joe retired his position was taken away and

couldn't be refilled. Anyway, with just two federal positions, it was obvious one of them had to be the manager. And if neither of them could do it, one of them had leave so we could hire a manager because we had two federal positions there and that's it. All the other employees, a dozen or so, are employees of the Depot. The Depot runs sort of like a state cooperative program where the leadership -- the state director and the district supervisors -- are federal employees, and many of the ground level specialists are state employees or are paid from cooperative monies; that's a pretty complicated funding structure.

Well the Depot's like that too; the Depot has a Depot fund and all the people there that do the routine work are employees of that fund, they're not federal employees. (Well I think they are Federal now; that's a recent change.) But at the time, the situation I faced was either the guy who was the manager had to do the job or Sherm Blom had to become the manager, or one of them had to leave so we could hire somebody else. Well the guy who was in the manager job was not doing very well. We actually had a situation there when I became responsible for the Depot, kind of like these post office shooting incidents you hear about where a postal employee "goes Postal" as they say.

**John:** Yeah, yeah.

**Guy:** ...comes in there shooting someday. That manager had all the employees so worried about their jobs that about half of them were actually consulting attorneys about their job rights. And the administrative lady, very nice, competent person, she was waking up at three in the morning with headaches just scared to go to work that

day for fear of what might happen. Well that's the situation I inherited.

So this individual who was the manager obviously had to shape up or ship out. As it turned out I went through a lot of the bureaucratic hoops that you have to do with employees who aren't working well. As you know in the government service, it's really hard to fire somebody. If you have a substandard employee, it's hard to get rid of them, and most of the time these are not bad people; they're people who aren't performing well for whatever reason, but they are not intrinsically bad people and that makes it that much harder to dislike them or to take adverse action.

Anyway, I started adverse action on this person, giving him every opportunity to come around and start being what the manager had to be. He had managed to slide by for almost three years by then, just because previous supervisors found it too much work to do the responsible thing. And I was not really a good person to do this kind of supervision; I had never even had the required supervisory training. I worked for higher paid guys, real supervisors, that I thought could have dealt with this situation much better than I could. But in Wildlife Services when you get an assignment you do the best you can with it; it's always been that way. So I resolved, pretty early in my Depot supervision assignment, that by golly when I hand the Depot assignment off to somebody else, it's going to be in a lot better shape than it was when I got it.

Well the gentleman in the manager job there, Don Despain, he could see pretty soon that I was serious about it and he eventually resigned in order to keep a termination off of his record. And I was very thankful for him

doing that because he saved me a lot of work. Then I persuaded Sherm Blom to become the manager. Sherm didn't want to do it, but when Don resigned his federal position immediately went away too as APHIS was kind of hard up for position 'ceilings' just then, you know how that goes. So we weren't in a position to hire a new manager.

Anyway, Sherm did take the manager job after I did enough arm twisting and I think he probably was the best manager the Depot ever had. He became the manager in August 1996. He did the job well but retired as soon as he was eligible, in September of 2003. And he not only retired, he went on vacation the last six weeks so nobody could come sneaking in and giving him a retirement party; he didn't want one.

**John:** It's interesting.

**Guy:** Sherm was a life-long bachelor; he lives now in a camp trailer in Arizona or New Mexico and I'm still in touch with him. My wife and I went down and paid him a visit about a year ago.

Several years after Sherm retired, the first woman Supply Depot Director was picked. Doris Zemlicka is her name; she took office in January 2007. She came from the NWRC Predator Research Group at Logan, Utah. She'd been there for quite a few years. Earlier, back in the late '70's and early '80's, she worked here at the Denver Federal Center in the Predator Research Section, Predator Damage Assessment project. Then she became a research biologist over at Logan, Utah and while there she completed a master's degree at Utah State. So now she's Pocatello Supply Depot manager. I've had no contact with her since she took office and I have not been to the Depot since then, so I

don't know much about how it's going. Anyway, that's some of my Depot stories.

I will tell you one or two humorous incidents, if I may, harking back to that big EIS assignment. As I mentioned before, APHIS dragged its feet for a while before they made a serious start on the EIS. Well then the next order of business was to solicit bids, proposals, and select a contractor who was going to do the EIS for us. This took longer than it should, but eventually a contract was signed in about September 1988. And the contract work was going to be supervised from the APHIS Operational Support Staff at Hyattsville like it should have been. The OSS Assistant Director, John Wood, was named the Contracting Officer's Representative, meaning that he was to manage all information contacts between the ADC program and the contractor. Mr. Wood was a very unique character, the kind that only develops in large bureaucracies. He also had once been the ADC state supervisor in one of the Dakotas, back in another life.

Anyway, about two or three months after the contract was let, the contractor went around Mr. Wood to our headquarters in Washington, asking for a meeting with other ADC program people because he wasn't getting anything from Mr. Wood. This contractor's complaint led to a big meeting in December 1988 between a group of ADC people and the contractor's staff. I can remember it better than most things that happened that long ago. The contractor was Dames and Moore; they had a big plush office in Bethesda, Maryland quite near the subway stop there on the red line.

I was one of the ADC people summoned to this meeting at Dames and Moore. Our intent was to talk with the

contractor about what this EIS had to be and how we're going to do it and how we're going to get organized. Well of course Mr. Wood also was at this meeting and he dropped a couple zingers on the contractor that caught the rest of us by surprise too. He told them, just as serious as can be, "When it comes to the economic analysis, it needs to be done in energy units – barrels of oil. Not dollars, but energy units." There is some kind of academic rational for this, I know there is, but to me and the rest of us, other than Mr. Wood, it didn't make sense for our EIS. Ever since then that meeting has been known as the "Barrels of Oil" meeting.

So John Wood's laying this on the people and we're sitting there, the rest of us on the committee, looking at one another thinking, "Did you hear what I think I heard?" And while we're trying to digest that and fathom what the heck he was talking about, he went right on to say, "Also the framework for analysis of environmental impacts is going to be common property resource theory." You know that that means? Well have you heard of Garrett Hardin's writings about the *Tragedy of the Commons*? This is the principle if you have a publicly owned resource that everybody can use without any limits the resource gets destroyed. So that's common property resource theory.

How that can be a framework for analysis of environmental impacts, John never did explain and the rest of us could never figure it out. Well that meeting took two days, and the day after it ended John Wood not only was no longer the contracting officer's representative, he was no longer an ADC employee; he was transferred off to another agency within APHIS -- BBEP, the environmental documentation group.

And his supervisor at the OSS, who was Dale Wade; I don't know if you know Dale.

**John:** I know the name, anyway, yeah.

**Guy:** Well Dale was the first official director of the OSS and he was John Wood's supervisor. And Dale also was part of that Dakota group from the '60's, the good old days of 1080 and stuff. Anyway, Dale was held responsible for that state of affairs that we had going on there; he was removed from office as director of the OSS and put on special assignment down in the basement of the agriculture building downtown by the Capital Mall until he went away and retired.

Well then, suddenly our Technical Review Group was summoned to take the place of those people that were no longer there. The TRG leader was Dennis Slate, a terrific individual, intellect and hard worker; at that time he was ADC State Director for Vermont and New Hampshire. He's now the National Rabies Program Coordinator for Wildlife Services and still a good friend. I was the main research person on the TRG, and there were about four others from operations and APHIS headquarters; a total of six of us. So we had to get to work then, start working with a contractor getting an EIS together and we did. I worked on that probably more than any other individual except maybe Dennis.

There was not much satisfaction in doing an EIS. I hated to spend as much time as I did on it. The EIS assignment probably kept me from doing some significant research that I otherwise would have done, which might have even gotten me a grade promotion I never did get.

So the only reward of that service was the personal friendships with fellow committee members. We really did become personal friends and we did enjoy all those long working sessions in Washington D.C. which were always at least two weeks and sometimes three weeks including the weekends. Anyway Dennis and the rest of us saw it through until the end.

After 3 hard years we had got to the point where we were publishing the draft EIS, in 1990. At that time we TRG members went to the ADC Management Team and pitched to them the idea that now they needed a NEPA expert at the headquarters to take over this project and see it through. Having published the Draft EIS, we could see from this point forward the project would need a lot more coordination at the headquarters level.

You see, all of us TRG members were stationed hundreds of miles away; we weren't in Washington. They'd already tried to get Dennis Slate to transfer to Washington but he wouldn't do it. So the management group did accept our recommendation and did create an Environmental Manager position. From that beginning the Wildlife Services environmental documentation staff has grown into the structure they have now with 6 or 8 people doing that kind of work.

**John:** Well I think, you know, that you've done a really good job here. I think that we can call it a day if you like; I think you've covered a lot of interesting topics and I really appreciate you talking the time to do it.

**Guy:** Well thank you, it's a pleasure to talk to you about all these things; some of them I haven't thought of for many

years. Let me show you a couple of my pictures here and bring things to a close. This is, of course, the National Bison Range. I might mention when I went to work there as a student trainee, I think I said before the manager was C.J. Henry. There was an assistant manager named Don Lewis, and the foreman was gentleman named Babe May, Victor B. May.

**John:** Okay.

**Guy:** The two maintenance were Ernie Kraft....

**John:** He wrote the book.

**Guy:** ...and Grant Hogge, top-notch workers and colleagues in every way that you could name. And the secretary in the place was Gladys Young. Now her husband, Cy Young, had been the maintenance foreman at the Bison Range for many years; he had worked there practically his whole life. He was the one who first discovered the white buffalo, Big Medicine, out on the range when it was born in 1933. And he and his co-workers then got that special baby and its mother in right away and started taking care of them. This is Big Medicine. This picture was taken by a friend of mine only about a week before Big Medicine died. And you can see...

[General talk and showing photos.]

**John:** All right, I think that will conclude the interview there, Guy, and again thank you very much for....

End of interview